

R E P L Y

T O

James
DR GREGORY,

B Y

DR JAMES HAMILTON Junior.

1. 1539

“ Cet ouvrage a seduit beaucoup de gens, parce qu’il est écrit avec beaucoup d’art ; parce qu’on y suppose eternellement ce qui est en question ; parce que plus on y manque de preuves, plus on y multiplie les probabilités ; parce qu’une infinité de conjectures sont mises en principes, et qu’on en tire comme conséquences d’autres conjectures.”

MONTESQUIEU.

EDINBURGH :

1793.

1871

1872

1873

P R E F A C E.

THE fate of the Author of this Reply is singularly hard. Engaged in the exercise of duties which require the most sacred regard to the principles of the strictest honour, and for which a moderate share of professional knowledge is absolutely necessary, he is unexpectedly charged, in the most public manner, with the commission of deliberate villany, and loaded with the imputation of the grossest ignorance; and these charges are brought forward by Dr Gregory, Professor of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh, and son of the Author of the Duties of a Physician.

This gentleman, unbiassed by any personal motives (according to his own account), unfashioned by the public body, which, he pretends, has been injured, and unsupported by the individuals whom he has endeavoured to avenge, has, in the

most open manner, and in the most explicit terms, declared his conviction, that a pamphlet, calculated, in his opinion, to injure the University of Edinburgh, to ruin the public character of some of the Professors, and to raise the fame and to promote the pecuniary interest of the present Professor of Midwifery, Dr A. Hamilton, at the expence of his colleagues, originated from Dr Hamilton's Son, the Author of this Reply.

In support of this charge, although he repeatedly acknowledges that he has no direct proof, he has adduced a train of circumstantial evidence, artfully calculated to impose on the public.

Dragged in this manner into the notice of the world, the Author is conscious that he has many disadvantages to overcome, and many prejudices to combat: for an attack from one placed in so elevated a rank as Dr Gregory, enforced by every argument which ingenuity can suggest, and rendered interesting by a pompous display of fancy and erudition, cannot fail to have vanquished many minds.

But he hopes and trusts, that the language of truth, simple and unadorned as it is, and ought to be, will counterbalance every

every disadvantage, and triumph over every prejudice.

In the following pages the author proves, *first*, That Dr Gregory's charge against him is utterly void of truth; *2dly*, That all the arguments advanced in his celebrated Pamphlet are founded on false allegations, and misrepresented facts; *3dly*, That some circumstances were, or might have been known to Dr Gregory, which shew clearly, that there were no grounds for suspicion against him; and, *lastly*, That he has been calumniated and injured in the most unjustifiable manner.

He should never certainly have replied to such a publication as that of Dr Gregory, had he been able to vindicate himself in a more effectual manner; but however extravagant and unguarded the Doctor may have been in what he has said respecting the author's Father, Dr A. Hamilton, he has studied, with much care, every contemptible chicane by which he could evade being amenable to justice by the Son; and yet he has publicly condemned similar artifices in others, and boldly challenged both Father and Son to a court of law.

REPLY,



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

<https://archive.org/details/b24920599>

R E P L Y, &c.

- I. PROOF THAT THE PAMPHLET, INTITLED, "A GUIDE FOR GENTLEMEN STUDYING MEDICINE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH," DID NOT PROCEED FROM ME.

A Pamphlet, exhibiting a view of the medical classes at this university, appeared here about the beginning of October last. A copy of it having been sent by the mail-coach to my father, along with copies to other professors, and the same parcel having contained one also for me, we saw it on the 6th of October, some days before it was sold in any of the book-sellers shops here.

Some weeks after its appearance, I learned by accident that the pamphlet was imagined

gined by several people to have proceeded from me. As I was exceedingly anxious to shew that this insinuation was entirely destitute of foundation, I proposed to my Father to transmit a letter (which I had actually written) to the publishers, requesting them to contradict the report. But he dissuaded me from that measure, as he said, I should soon be involved in many troublesome correspondences if I paid attention to every foolish report.

Of the propriety of adopting this advice I was completely convinced, by having accidentally discovered the origin of the report; for I found, that on one day at least, between the 15th and 27th of October, Dr Rutherford was heard to say, in the physicians room of the Royal Infirmary, That he was sure the pamphlet proceeded from me, for it contained the sentiments respecting his class which I had often openly expressed.

On the 23d of November, having learned, by a conversation with Mr Alexander Wood, that Dr Rutherford was propagating the report with great industry, I agreed, at his desire, to inform the Doctor of his mistake in attributing the pamphlet to me. Mr Wood said, that he advised

vifed me to take this ſtep, from a wiſh to ſerve both parties ; for he thus gave me an opportunity of vindicating my character, and he was certain that it would afford Dr Rutherford much pleaſure to be undeceived. I therefore, on that evening, ſent to the Doctor the following letter, and received the following answer :

“ SIR, *Edinburgh, Nov. 23. 1792.*

“ HAVING been told by Mr Alexander
 “ Wood this afternoon, that you have al-
 “ leged that I am the author of a pamph-
 “ let, intituled, ‘ A Guide for Gentlemen
 “ ſtudying Medicine at the Univerſity of
 “ Edinburgh,’ I take this method of in-
 “ forming you, that I neither wrote that
 “ Pamphlet, nor had the ſmalleſt concern
 “ in the publication, either directly or in-
 “ directly.

“ As the allegation may be prejudicial
 “ to my character, I hope and truſt you
 “ will take every opportunity of contra-
 “ dicting the report.

“ I have the honour to be, &c.

“ JAS HAMILTON jun.”

B

SIR,

“ SIR, *Friday Evening, Nov. 23.*

“ YOU must have misunderstood Mr
 “ Wood, in suspecting that any supposi-
 “ tion of your being the Author of the
 “ Pamphlet you allude to originated with
 “ me. I confess myself totally ignorant
 “ who was the Author of it. I certainly
 “ have heard it imputed to you among
 “ others ; but as all seemed to me to be
 “ vague report, I have never given my-
 “ self any trouble about it. If you think
 “ the allegiance can be prejudicial to you,
 “ you must yourself clear yourself of the
 “ imputation. I can do nothing farther
 “ in this than acknowledging your ha-
 “ ving disavowed it to me, if I am ever
 “ spoken to upon the subject, which I
 “ hardly expect to be.

“ I am, &c.

“ D. RUTHERFORD.”

ON the day after the receipt of my letter, Dr Rutherford sent to an attorney in London an order for prosecuting the publisher of the pamphlet ; for, as Dr Gregory informs us, an attorney called on the Mess. Robinson on the 27th of November, to desire that they should give up
 the

the author ; but this request, we are told, was refused.

I make no comment on this conduct. Whatever the intention may have been, the obvious probable effect was, the depriving me of the only direct means by which I could fully establish my innocence, as it was natural to suppose, that the threatened prosecution would prevent the author of the pamphlet from declaring himself ; for what man would voluntarily expose himself to the resentment of the Professors of the University of Edinburgh?

Dr Rutherford then gave his consent (by his own account of the matter), that Dr Gregory should bring the affair before the Senatus Academicus.

Accordingly, on the 10th of December, my Father put into my hands a printed letter, signed by Dr Gregory, stating, that at the annual meeting of the Senatus Academicus, appointed to be held that evening, he had some interesting information to give on a pamphlet, intitled, &c. and some animadversions and motions to make respecting it. This letter was inclosed in a written letter, also signed by the Doctor, desiring, that no circumstance whatever might prevent my Father from attending

the meeting, as the matter concerned him very nearly. When my Father asked my opinion on these letters, I told him, that I supposed Dr Gregory alluded to the report respecting me, and added, that he might assure the *Senatus Academicus* that I could, if necessary, very satisfactorily clear myself.

My Father's astonishment was very great, when he found the charge transferred from me to himself; but from what Dr Gregory said, he was strongly impressed with the idea of my having had some concern in the publication of the pamphlet; and in this idea he might have been confirmed next day; for, in an accidental conversation with him, the Doctor, in the most explicit terms, said, " I can bring the charge home *directly* to your Son; and I hope to bring it home also to yourself."

The absurdity of the latter part of the sentence put him on his guard against believing the former part, otherwise the impression might have been fatal to our domestic happiness.

The result of the deliberation of the *Senatus Academicus* was a refusal of Dr Gregory's request to enter into a judicial investigation

vestigation of the origin of the pamphlet, and a dismissal of the affair.

Although I was very anxious to receive from Dr Gregory an explanation of his expression to my Father respecting me, I was advised to wait the result of the prosecution said to be then carrying on in London against the publisher, on the principle, That if the author should be discovered, I should receive much credit for having acted with moderation.

But, after having waited for some time, I learned that Dr Gregory, with the most persevering industry, was endeavouring to persuade every person with whom he was acquainted, that, however innocent the Father might be, the Son was certainly guilty; and one gentleman, on the 17th of January, told me in plain terms, that even my own friends were of opinion, that no innocent person would tamely submit to the insinuations of Dr Gregory, and his associates, by quashing the affair, as I seemed to wish.

Hurt that my conduct should be thus interpreted, I resolved to give Dr Gregory an opportunity of explaining his reasons for accusing me; and therefore, notwithstanding my Father's earnest entreaties that

I should leave him to fall by his own weight, I sent him a letter, of which the following is a copy.

“ SIR, *Edinburgh, Jan. 17. 1793.*

“ I HAVE been told by several people,
 “ that although I sent a letter to Dr Ru-
 “ therford, which you must have seen,
 “ asserting that I had no concern what-
 “ ever in the publication of a pamphlet,
 “ intitled, ‘ A Guide for Gentlemen stu-
 “ dying Medicine in the University of E-
 “ dinburgh,’ you still persist in alleging
 “ that the work originated from me, or
 “ that I had assisted the author.

“ As I cannot be induced to believe,
 “ that a man in your respectable situation
 “ should subject himself to the conse-
 “ quences of *falsely calumniating* any per-
 “ son’s character, I am inclined to think,
 “ that the gentlemen who have given me
 “ this information have mistaken your
 “ meaning.—But, as I feel myself much
 “ interested in knowing the truth, I take
 “ this method to learn from you, whe-
 “ ther I have been misinformed or not.

“ I am, &c.

“ JAS HAMILTON jun.”

My

My intentions in thus expressing myself were, that if it should appear, as I greatly suspected it might do, that some person behind the curtain had suggested to the Doctor false or ideal evidence, I might give him an opportunity of being undeceived; or that, if the Doctor should choose to confirm the reports which I had heard, I might obtain proper redress by law.

To my great astonishment, I received next morning the following letter.

“ S I R,

{ *St John's Street, Thursday*
Evening, Jan. 17. 1793.

“ HAVING no direct knowledge of who
 “ were or who were not concerned in the
 “ composition and publication of the
 “ pamphlet you mention, I never thought
 “ myself intitled to *allege*, or simply and
 “ positively assert, that you or that your
 “ Father had or had not any concern in it.
 “ On the contrary, I thought it would
 “ have been necessary for the University
 “ to have obtained a strict judicial inquiry
 “ into that matter; which inquiry
 “ should have terminated either in the full
 “ and honourable acquittal, or in the com-
 “ plete

“ plete conviction and exemplary punish-
 “ ment, of the person *suspected* *.

“ I never dreamed of asking any per-
 “ son whether he were the author of that
 “ pamphlet, nor of paying any regard to
 “ any person’s denial of his being con-
 “ cerned in it; for this plain reason, that
 “ I was sure whoever was concerned in it
 “ would deny it. It contains such things
 “ as no man can avow without incurring
 “ lasting infamy. This the author well
 “ knew; and accordingly published it un-
 “ der a false name, and with the most ex-
 “ traordinary precautions to baffle inquiry.
 “ He published it with a resolution to deny
 “ it. The false name on the title-page is

* If the intelligent reader compare this sentence with one which occurs in the 148th page of Dr Gregory’s pamphlet, he must admire the accuracy of the Doctor’s ideas on distributive justice.

“ It is self-evident, that no regard is due to any decla-
 “ ration of the author of the pamphlet; he can have no
 “ pretensions to veracity or credibility. What regard,
 “ then, can be paid to the declaration of one SUPPOSED
 “ to be the author.”

It would appear from these sentences, that the learned Doctor considers *suspicion* and *guilt* to be synonymous terms: But it must be owned, that this notion is not peculiar to him, as the conduct of the French metaphysicians amply testifies.

“ *ipso*

“ *ipso facto* a denial of it by the real author
 “ or authors.

“ I did see your letter to Dr Rutherford, and also his answer to it; which
 “ answer appears to me a very proper one.

“ You know perfectly the general suspicions and opinion which have prevailed concerning the origin and purpose of that pamphlet. You know also
 “ on what particulars of internal evidence
 “ and collateral circumstances that opinion
 “ is founded. From the hour I read the
 “ pamphlet I adopted that opinion; and I
 “ still retain it. I have mentioned it openly, and also the reasons on which it is
 “ founded; particularly in so far as related
 “ to your Father.

“ This, I presume, the persons who gave
 “ you your information have called persist-
 “ ing in alleging that the pamphlet originated from you.

“ If you think fit to do me the honour
 “ to single me out as the object either of
 “ your personal resentment, or of legal
 “ prosecution, for that general and very
 “ natural opinion, you are heartily welcome. My conduct from first to last
 “ in the business has been upright and
 “ open: and I care not how generally it

“ be known, or how severely it be scruti-
 “ nized.

“ JAMES GREGORY.”

The Doctor had asserted to my Father, on the 11th of December, that he could bring the charge home to me. In this letter he expressly denies having alleged, or simply and positively asserted, that I or that my Father had or had not any concern in the composition and publication of the Guide ; and then he says, that he had adopted, and still retained, the public opinion and suspicions respecting the origin of that pamphlet. It is true, he has given a very different account of his conversation with my Father ; but allowing his own story to be true, and that his expression to my Father was, “ No matter ; “ I shall bring the charge home either to “ yourself or your Son,” certainly a man, whose understanding is of the ordinary kind, must think, that such an expression contains a very strong positive assertion, that either my Father or I were concerned in the publication.

The effect of that letter on my mind was irresistible. I could not avoid regarding it as a most extraordinary production.

I considered it as an aukward attempt to evade a fair and candid discussion of the matter; and the bullying style in which it was couched inspired me with contempt. I yielded to the impulse, and instantly adopted a resolution very different from what I had formerly formed. I determined to submit his and Dr Rutherford's letter to the Professors of the University, and to the principal medical practitioners of this city, that I might exhibit, in their own words, the grounds on which the gentlemen had founded their charge against me.

I immediately informed Dr Gregory of the sentiments with which his letter had inspired me, by sending him the following Note.

“ SIR, *Edinburgh, Jan. 18. 1793.*

“ I cannot choofe, for the object of *per-*
 “ *sonal resentment*, any man who could write
 “ fo extraordinary a letter as that which
 “ you have done me the honour to addrefs
 “ to me.

“ You mentioned to my Father, on the
 “ 11th of December last, that *you could*
 “ *bring your charge home to me.* You have
 “ now DENIED that, and shelter your-
 C 2 “ self

“ self under the canopy of public *opinions*
 “ and *suspensions* ;—opinions and suspensions
 “ which probably originated from, and
 “ certainly were sanctioned and carefully
 “ propagated by, yourself and Dr Ruther-
 “ ford.

“ Your letter, and his ‘ *very proper one*,’
 “ shall be laid before the public, who will
 “ then be able to judge, how far the con-
 “ duct of either of you has been ‘ *upright*
 “ *and open*.’

“ JAS HAMILTON jun.”

I waited for some time, that I might see
 if the Doctor chose to explain the incon-
 sistency of his letter ; but as he declined do-
 ing so, I printed the correspondence ; and
 inclosing it in a circular letter, signed by
 my own hand, I sent copies to the Pro-
 fessors of the University, and the princi-
 pal medical practitioners in this city. By
 this I gave a public testimony of my de-
 sire to have the affair properly investi-
 gated.

But I heard no more of the matter, ex-
 cept some vague reports of Dr Gregory’s
 intention to answer my letters, until the
 6th of June, when a pamphlet of 176 pages
 intitled, “ Answer to Dr James Hamilton
 “ junior

“ junior, by Dr Gregory,” was sent me
 “ from the Author.”

In this pamphlet, he has detailed, at great length, and with much art, all the circumstances of internal and collateral evidence, which, in his opinion, render it probable that my Father or I were concerned in the publication of the Guide, &c.

Had the Doctor, in this work, stated his grounds of suspicion in the style of a gentleman, or of a man of science, I should have considered him as my friend, for having given me an opportunity of clearing myself of the injurious charges which have been propagated with so much industry, by persons who it now appears have been for a long time in the habit of endeavouring to hurt my Father and his family.

But although, from the manner in which Dr Gregory has thought fit to attack me, I cannot regard him in the respectable light of one who wishes that a young man's character should be properly vindicated, I certainly consider myself much indebted to him for the uncommon pains he has taken in stating every circumstance which

can possibly be urged in support of the suspicions entertained against me. I am thereby enabled to vindicate myself in the most effectual manner, and to confute completely the gentlemen who have been so industrious in the propagation of the ill-founded reports.

After having submitted Dr Gregory's pamphlet to the consideration of some gentlemen on whose judgement and candour I could depend, I found that their opinion on the subject coincided with my own; and therefore I wrote to the publishers of the Guide, the Mess. Robinson of London, on the 26th of June, requesting that they would give up the author of that work; and having received no answer, I wrote to them again, on the 13th of July, anxiously desiring, that if they would not give up the author, they would at least clear me.

This letter was sent under cover to Mr Chalmer, of Abingdon Street, Westminster, with a short statement of the case, to shew to that gentleman, and also to the Mess. Robinson, of what consequence it was to me to obtain from them a declaration

tion

tion of the truth. How Mr Chalmer conducted himself, and what was the result, will appear from a letter he thought himself obliged to write to Dr Gregory, and which I have his leave to publish.

“ S I R,

“ Having been desired by Dr Alexander Hamilton and Dr James Hamilton, of Edinburgh, to use my endeavours to obtain from the Mess. Robinson of Paternoster Row, booksellers, answers to certain questions they sent me, tending to discover who was the author of a pamphlet, intitled, ‘ A Guide for Gentlemen studying Medicine at the University of Edinburgh ;’ and whether they had any concern in the composition or publication ; I applied accordingly to the Mess. Robinson ; and conceiving that they might scruple at giving information to one of the parties, or make that a pretence for not involving themselves farther in a controversy which has been carried on with so much warmth, I made it *my own* request, that they would speak the truth, let it strike which way it would, pled-

E

“ ging

“ ging myself, that what they said should
 “ be communicated to both the parties in
 “ the dispute. I gave them time to con-
 “ sider, and, if they pleased, to inquire
 “ into my character, and pointed out per-
 “ sons known to them, in London, from
 “ whom they might learn it.

“ I took this step without instructions
 “ from the Drs Hamilton; and it may
 “ appear to you that it was a pretty ex-
 “ traordinary one for an agent employed
 “ by, and only known to, one of the par-
 “ ties. I shall candidly state the consider-
 “ ation that induced me to it. Besides
 “ thinking it the most likely way of pre-
 “ vailing on the Mess. Robinson, who pro-
 “ bably never heard of my name, I was
 “ led to believe that my employers, from
 “ their manner of writing to me, had no-
 “ thing to fear from a discovery of the
 “ truth; and if they had, their finding
 “ fault with or resenting my conduct
 “ could be of little consequence.

“ The result was, that the elder Mr Ro-
 “ binson, at a meeting some days after I
 “ sent him the questions, solemnly assu-
 “ red me, that whatever suspicions they
 “ entertained, they could not with cer-
 “ tainty or propriety name the author;
 “ but

“ but they did not know or believe, or
 “ had any reason to believe, that either
 “ Dr Alexander or Dr James Hamilton
 “ had any concern in, connection with,
 “ or knowledge of, the writing or pub-
 “ lishing the pamphlet in question; but,
 “ on the contrary, they verily believed
 “ they neither had or now have the least
 “ knowledge of the author. I here use
 “ the very words of Mr Robinson, in his
 “ general assertion to me; and he added
 “ fundry circumstances which convince
 “ me, that you have been led to form erro-
 “ neous conclusions on the subject; for I
 “ have now read your printed answer to
 “ Dr Hamilton. I hope, and believe, that
 “ it is impossible for any man who has
 “ the least regard to character, (and I un-
 “ derstand Mr Robinson’s to be very re-
 “ spectable), to tell a string of falsehoods,
 “ without motive, when he had nothing
 “ to do but decline to meet or converse
 “ with one entirely a stranger to him.

“ I think myself obliged to write this
 “ letter to you, in discharge of my vo-
 “ luntary engagement to Mr Robinson,
 “ though he intimated no desire for my
 “ performing it. I neither expect nor
 “ wish you to take the trouble of answer-

“ ing it; and I hope you will forgive me
“ for adding, that if you do, I shall not
“ reply.

“ I imagine, that though an obscure
“ person, Dr Gregory must have heard of
“ me; and I flatter myself it could not
“ be unfavourably. Lest you should not,
“ I add, that my profession is that of so-
“ liciting business from Scotland in the
“ Houses of Parliament, or what is com-
“ monly called a Scots Solicitor.

“ I am, with all due respect for your
“ general character and abilities, Sir, &c.

“ JA. CHALMER.

“ *Abingdon Street, Westminster,*

“ *13th August 1793.*

“ *Dr James Gregory, &c. Edinburgh.*”

That there might be no objections to the conclusions which I meant to draw from the contents of the above, I sent to Dr Gregory the following letter.

“ S I R,

“ On Friday last, I received a letter
“ from Mr Chalmer of London, by which

“ I

“ I learn that he wrote to you by the same
“ post.

“ His purpose in writing to you, he
“ informs me, was to fulfil his promise
“ to the Mess. Robinson, that he should
“ communicate the result of his conversa-
“ tion with them to both parties concern-
“ ed in the subject on which he addressed
“ them.

“ As you have so often declared, that
“ your conduct towards me was influ-
“ enced by no personal consideration, I
“ flattered myself, that in consequence of
“ Mr Chalmer's letter, you would have vo-
“ luntarily stepped forward, and offered,
“ as a gentleman, that apology for your
“ behaviour to which I consider myself to
“ be intitled.

“ But although some days have now e-
“ lapsed since you must have received that
“ letter, and you have made no such of-
“ fer; yet I am unwilling to draw the ob-
“ vious conclusion from such conduct,
“ without giving you an opportunity of
“ explaining yourself — and that I now
“ do.

“ After what has passed on your part,
“ I certainly was not bound to afford you
“ an opportunity of this kind; — but I
“ thereby

“ thereby finish the sketch by which my
 “ conduct in this singular controversy
 “ may be judged; and I also complete,
 “ in my opinion, the contrast between
 “ us.

“ If I do not receive a satisfactory an-
 “ swer from you within the space of twen-
 “ ty-four hours from this date, I shall pro-
 “ ceed to take those steps in my own vin-
 “ dication which it is incumbent on one
 “ to do, who has been as much injured
 “ as

“ JAS HAMILTON Jun.

“ *Castlehill, August 19. 1793,*

“ *Ten o’Clock, A. M.*

“ *To Dr James Gregory, &c.”*

As I have received no answer to the above letter, I am intitled to conclude, either that the Doctor is now convinced of his error, but is determined not to acknowledge it; or that he has adopted the laudable resolution of adhering obstinately to his own opinion, founded on the most palpably erroneous conjectures, in opposition to the most direct unimpeached testimony.

If the former conclusion be just, the Doctor's conduct will be properly estimated by every man of honour; and if the latter, the medical reader will be at no loss to form a decided judgement on the state of his intellects.

The declaration, therefore, to which I put my name on the 21st of January, stating, that I had had no concern whatever in the publication of the Guide, is thus proved to be true, I flatter myself, to the conviction of every impartial person. Its truth will be completely established by legal testimony, in the course of the judicial proceedings against Dr Gregory at present carrying on by my Father.

II. PROOF THAT ALL THE ARGUMENTS ADVANCED BY DR GREGORY, ARE FOUNDED ON FALSE ALLEGATIONS AND MISREPRESENTED FACTS.

HAVING thus demonstrated, by evidence which must command the assent of every person of liberality and candour, that Dr Gregory's charge against me is
false

false and injurious, it may be thought that I might rest the matter here. But though what has been already stated does completely vindicate my character, yet as it by no means does justice to that of Dr Gregory, I next proceed to inquire, how far the circumstances urged by him in support of the opinion, that I am the author of the Guide, which he has been at so much pains to propagate, can enforce belief in the mind of any man of common sense.

The result of the inquiry, I trust, will be, that such circumstances could not have influenced any man who had not previously adopted an opinion which he was determined not to relinquish, but, on the contrary, to use every endeavour to establish.

His evidence is of two kinds, Internal and Collateral.

DR GREGORY'S INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

I. That Midwifery is not only the favourite Subject of the Author of the Guide, but is even the principal Object in the Work.

A perusal of the pamphlet, however, must convince every candid person that there are other classes as warmly praised by the author, and that there are also other classes of which as particular an account is given. Indeed, had Dr Gregory chosen to have done so, he might, by the same exertions of ingenuity, have proved, that any of the other professors praised in the pamphlet was as much concerned in it as he has alledged my Father to have been.

But even allowing Dr Gregory's assertion to be true, "That the whole work
 " smells insufferably of midwifery," it would surely be a poor compliment to the students at this University, to be told,
 " You shall not form a prejudice in fa-
 " vour of any particular class, especially
 " in favour of one which we do not re-
 " gard as a department of medicine."
 Yet Dr Gregory's remarks imply a command of this kind.

With all due deference to the profound erudition and extraordinary abilities of Dr Gregory, I must inform him, that others differ from him, both in their choice and in their ideas of the utility and importance of their objects of study. That

many gentlemen entertain different sentiments respecting midwifery from what he does, is demonstrated from the circumstance, that many practitioners confine themselves exclusively to that profession.

This shews how absurd it is to suppose, as Dr Gregory does, that it is impossible for any student to form a partial attachment to that branch of medical practice.

Until the learned Doctor shall be fortunate enough to persuade all mankind, that his *sic volo, sic jubeo*, shall be a sufficient reason for adopting any opinion he may think proper to espouse, his internal evidence, derived from a difference in sentiment from him respecting the importance or usefulness of any art or science, must be allowed to be a proof rather calculated to excite contempt, than to enforce conviction.

II. *That the Author seems intimately acquainted with many recent occurrences in the University; as, the Summer Clinical Lectures, Dr Duncan's Lectures on Medical Jurisprudence, and Dr Rothcrum's being Dr Black's Assistant.*

Parva leves capiunt animos. Admirable

ble proofs that the author must be a member of the University, or nearly connected with one ! The summer clinical lectures had been established for two seasons ; they were well known to all the students, and they were publicly advertised : Nay, the Author of the Guide quotes them and the mathematics, &c. from an advertisement in a newspaper. Dr Duncan, in the year 1790, published a Syllabus of his Lectures, in which he mentioned his improvement on his predecessor's plan, by the addition of Observations on Medical Jurisprudence ; and Dr Rotheram had appeared as Dr Black's assistant daily for a whole winter, before two or three hundred gentlemen.

Although some gentlemen write on subjects without having made any previous inquiry into the affairs on which they pretend to lead the judgement of the public, it cannot be allowed that every author is equally careless. Had, therefore, Dr Gregory even been able to prove that J. Johnson, Esq; was acquainted with circumstances known only to a few individuals, it would have still been necessary for him to shew, that he could have had no opportunity of acquiring the information.

III. *That the Author is perfectly well acquainted with the Advantages which annual Pupils to the Midwifery Class at this University enjoy.*

BUT these advantages are so well known to the students, that in general many more gentlemen apply to be received on such terms than can be admitted. Had Dr Gregory ever conversed with any annual pupil either of the late Dr Young or of the present professor, he would have found that the professor of midwifery derives very little pecuniary advantage from such pupils, while he necessarily incurs much trouble by them. For the extra fee paid for the privilege of being annual pupil is Two guineas and a half; only four are admitted annually; hence *Ten guineas* yearly is the whole emolument accruing from them. But for this sum the professor (or an assistant in whom he can confide) must not only assist these gentlemen at all times with his advice, frequently at the most unreasonable hours, but must also always superintend, and often himself undertake, the many difficult operations which they are called on to perform. It may be asked, then, for what reason does the professor of midwifery take annual pupils? For the benevolent

benevolent purpose of saving many valuable lives to the community, for which his own exertions as an individual would be totally inadequate. And that many lives are annually preserved by such means, I could produce the most incontestible evidence.

IV. *That the Author mentions, that Dr Hamilton engages to furnish his Pupils with private deliveries ; — which, Dr Gregory observes, is the very language of an advertisement.*

ANY reasonable man, before he deduced such an inference, would certainly have conversed with some of the pupils of the midwifery class on the subject. Had Dr Gregory done so, he would have learned, that one of the most common questions put by the pupils is, whether they are intitled to deliver women in the lying-in-ward during their attendance on the first course? And the constant answer is, that they are not; but if they be very anxious to see practice, they can have private deliveries, on condition that they pay a certain sum to the patient.

V. *That the Author observes, that the education of Dr Hamilton's Son has been regulated with the view of rendering him capable of the important task of being his Father's assistant: "Which implies," the Doctor remarks, "a knowledge of their history, and of the actions, and even the thoughts and motives, of Dr Hamilton."*

How wonderfully acute is this observation! It evinces a prodigious profundity of thought, and an astonishing subtlety of reasoning!

My Father has not only mentioned, at the beginning of each course of lectures, for these four years past, that he had long wished for an assistant, and had educated me for that purpose, but he has even said the same thing in his preface to his Treatise on the Management of Female Complaints.

But the observation under consideration deserves particular notice, as it proves in the most unequivocal manner the uprightness and candour of the Doctor's conduct towards me.

That the reader may understand this proof, he must be informed, that only two professors in the university have assistants, viz. Dr Black and my Father; that Dr Rother-

am,

am, Dr Black's assistant, had only appeared in that character in the winter preceding the publication of the Guide, while I had, for three years previous to that publication, been intrusted with the principal part of the charge of my Father's class; and that my Father gives three courses annually, and Dr Black only one.

Dr Gregory's observation, then, will be properly estimated, by comparing what the author of the Guide has said of Dr Rotheram, with what he has said of me.

Dr Black's " choice has fallen on a
 " gentleman whom his accomplishments
 " render highly worthy of such an office,
 " Dr Rotheram, well known in the medi-
 " cal and philosophical world. By his
 " assistance, Dr Black is enabled to give
 " the most valuable course of lectures on
 " chemistry which is at present delivered
 " by any professor."

" Dr Hamilton has been assisted for a-
 " bove three years by his son, whose edu-
 " cation has been regulated with the sole
 " design of rendering him capable of that
 " important task."

Dr Gregory, well aware that this circumstance would strike every person who had read the original pamphlet, and

considered the subject, has endeavoured, by an artifice really unworthy of himself, to invalidate the obvious conclusion which would be drawn from it, by alleging, that Dr Rotheram has received this compliment in consequence of a favour which he had done my Father, in a work to which he did not put his name.

As neither my Father nor myself knew of this favour, I was obliged to enquire into the circumstance at Dr Rotheram himself; for I was very anxious to know the particulars, as Dr Gregory had styled it a good story. To my very great surprise, I found that the obligation alluded to, was a favourable review of my Father's edition of Smellie's plates. That the value of this important service may be properly appreciated, it is necessary to inform the candid reader, that Mr Creech having purchased the original plates of Smellie, requested my Father to improve the practical observations added to each plate, which he did after much trouble, and for which he received no share in the emoluments of the work, and indeed no compensation *.

* Unless an octavo copy of Hume's history of England be deemed such.

The review could not therefore benefit my Father; it could only serve Mr Creech. As my Father had no interest in the Review, he never enquired who was the author of it, and never knew who he was till now. How far it is consistent with reason to suppose that gratitude for such a favour could have suggested the flattering and merited, it is true, compliments paid Dr Rotheram in several parts of the Guide, it is not my intention to inquire.

VI. *That the Author of the pamphlet has displayed much rancour against Dr Rutherford, who had some years ago long and keenly opposed the admission of men-midwives as Fellows into the Royal College of Physicians, and who had more lately advised the abolition of the lying-in-ward of the Royal Infirmary.*

That Dr Rutherford's behaviour in the College of Physicians was never resented either by my Father or self, the Doctor has had many strong proofs.

His successful exertions in having the lying-in-ward of the Royal Infirmary abolished, were perfectly unknown to us; and notwithstanding Dr Gregory's strong positive assertions, the circumstance would have appeared

appeared incredible to us, had not the Doctor acquiesced in the charge.

It cannot be controverted, that the flourishing state of any university must depend very much on each individual professor appearing in his own particular department with every possible advantage; nor can it be denied, that the general prosperity of all the professors must be advantageous to each individually.

Now, as the world regards the study of midwifery to be essential to a medical practitioner, there must be a professor of that department in the university. But as that professor can no more teach midwifery without a lying-in-ward, than the professor of Botany can teach without a garden, it could not have been imagined that any man would have endeavoured to ruin one of his own colleagues, when it could have been attended with no immediate advantage to himself, and might have ultimately injured him.

Besides, Dr Rutherford must have known, that as my Father had received the charge of the lying-in-ward along with his professorship, it would have been inconsistent with the usual liberality of the patrons of the university, to have refused him some equivalent,

equivalent, if the managers of the Infirmary should have found it necessary to abolish that ward.

Since, however, Dr Rutherford has not thought fit to deny it, we must take the fact as Dr Gregory has represented it.

Dr Gregory, by his reasoning on this circumstance, has criminated his friend in a very unjustifiable manner. He has insinuated, that Dr Rutherford endeavoured to ruin my Father's class, not only without provocation, but also without affording him any opportunity of defending himself. While he has only charged us with having resented a treacherous and undeserved injury, not by means equally base, but openly by fair reasoning, by arguments publicly expressed, and, therefore, if false, easily refuted; for had all that is said in the pamphlet against Doctor Rutherford proceeded from us, it would have been a very inadequate return for the pains the Doctor had taken in having the lying-in-ward suppressed. Such a piece of service could only have been properly requited by a secret and successful attempt to have the Botanic Garden abolished.

For unless Dr Rutherford's intention had been to injure the Midwifery class,
by.

by advising the suppression of the lying-in-ward, his conduct on the occasion could not possibly have been resented by us.

But so different is my opinion on this subject from Dr Gregory's, that I declare, had Dr Rutherford's conduct in the Infirmary been known to me, I would have put a very different construction on it from what Dr Gregory has done; I would have regarded it in the proper point of view; for I would have considered, that the Doctor was actuated from a conviction, that the increased population of this city, the great number of workmen, and the very high prices of all the necessaries of life, rendered the establishment of a lying-in hospital, on a large scale, absolutely necessary, and that such an institution would contribute much to the advantage of the University.

In the opinion of all liberal-minded people, the expressions in the Guide respecting the Botanical class are not the suggestions of personal resentment, but convey only the too generally prevalent erroneous ideas concerning that class, which, however, it has not been proved were ever sanctioned by me.

VII. *That*

VII. *That the Author of the Guide has also shewn a rancour against the Professor of Mathematics, who teaches, during Summer, at the same hour with the Professor of Midwifery; and that the opinion respecting the study of Mathematics expressed in the Guide is peculiar to Dr James Hamilton.*

THAT Mr Playfair chose the hour at which the Midwifery class had met for above twenty years, although there was then another hour vacant, is certainly true.

But what should be thought of the heart of that man, who could suppose, that a trifling circumstance of this kind, for which Mr Playfair must have had good reasons, could occasion such a degree of resentment, and induce such a desire for revenge, as would lead to an attempt to ruin his class by an insidious attack in an anonymous pamphlet. *Quodcunque ostendis mihi sic, incredulus odi.* It never entered into my Father's mind to suppose that Mr Playfair meant him any injury by choosing his hour; and it is obvious that he suffered none by it, as his class has become more numerous every session since the circumstance took place.

As to the opinion, that the elements of geometry cannot be so well acquired at

a public class as by attending a private teacher, being peculiar to me, I positively deny it. Unless it were a generally received opinion, that young men learn mathematics much better by attending a private teacher than a public professor, we could not understand why a small proportion only of the young gentlemen educated in this city should attend the mathematical class in the University, when the Professor is acknowledged to be a man of very superior abilities, while the schools of private teachers are crowded, although some of those teachers have very little to recommend them.

VIII. *That the Author of the Guide has shewn an inveteracy against private Teachers, which could only have proceeded from one interested in injuring them.*

THE expressions in the Guide do not, in my opinion, warrant such a conclusion; but even although they did, the inference deduced by Dr Gregory is not fair: for no private teacher, on the plan hitherto adopted, can interfere with my Father. When one gives a few lectures or demonstrations for a few shillings, he holds out a temptation to many young men, which induces

induces them to attend his course, altho' otherwise they might never have studied the subject; a private teacher of Midwifery may therefore be very successful, without injuring, in the smallest degree, the professor.

IX. *That the Author of the Guide mentions, that Midwives are almost exclusively employed in low life in Edinburgh, which, Dr Gregory remarks, could only be known to a Practitioner of Midwifery in Edinburgh.*

BUT every gentleman who ever studied Midwifery here, knows this alledged extraordinary fact, nay, it is often mentioned by way of reproach in England, that in Scotland and Ireland the practice of Midwifery is entirely in the hands of women. Besides, I am told, that it is a common custom for the young gentlemen attending this University, who have formerly studied Midwifery at another place, to pay a sum of money to some of the midwives in low practice, for the privilege of attending along with them.

That there are many midwives in this city, of whose abilities, attention, and fidelity we can give honourable testimony from our own knowledge, we have oc-

caſion every day to mention ; indeed as many of them were my Father's own pupils, it would be a ſevere reproach on him if they were not well qualified for their duty. But that many ignorant women praſtiſe in low life, and commit frequent dangerous blunders, cannot be denied ; and is neceſſarily mentioned in the Midwifery claſs every courſe, on various occaſions, but more eſpecially in giving a view of the proportion of difficult caſes which occur in praſtice : two or three hundred pupils can atteſt it.

X. That all thoſe Profeſſors whoſe conduct has been obliging to the Profeſſor of Midwifery, or his Son, are liberally praſed in the Guide.

It happens, unfortunately for Dr. Gregory's argument, that the praſes in the Guide, like the cenſures, merely expreſs the general opinions of the ſtudents.

It would be a very diſagreeable taſk for me to follow the Doctor in his illuſtrations of the argument under conſideration. I ſhall therefore entirely paſs over all the illiberal remarks which he has made, altho' they afford an admirable ſpecimen both of

of the Doctor's talents as an inquisitor, and of his generosity as a man.

One circumstance, however, which has puzzled him strangely, I believe I can explain, not from any knowledge of the author's sentiments, I must observe, but from having conversed with several of the Doctor's pupils on the subject.

I allude to the praises bestowed on the Doctor in the Guide, contrasted with the opinion of him which the author has expressed in his letters. I must premise, that I offer this explanation under correction. If I have been misinformed, I shall readily acknowledge my regret for having ventured, in one instance, to repeat general reports.

It is said then, that Dr Gregory having employed much of the time of his first course of lectures after Dr Cullen's death, in metaphysical disquisitions, which his pupils did not understand, felt so very forcibly, that what he has called compliments in the Guide were ironical, that he exerted himself so much this last season, as to give a complete course for the first time since he was appointed Professor of the Practice.

XI. *That many of the expressions in the Guide are the same which the present Professor of Midwifery has been heard to use, both in private conversation and in public discourse.*

WHEN it is known that my Father gives three courses of lectures annually ; that at the beginning of each course he reads a short public lecture, in which he explains his plan, and that every person who chuses may attend that meeting, the whole force of this apparently formidable argument will fall to the ground ; for in giving an account of any man's opinions, one may naturally adopt some of his expressions.

But what will be thought of the argument when I assert, that, as far as I can judge, there is not a single expression of my Father's in the whole account ; nay, the view of his plan (although it might easily have been obtained, for every pupil who stays here three years might hear it nine times) is no more correct than that of the other professors. It exhibits the general outline indeed ; but that outline is sketched out in his text-book, and is nearly common to his plan, with that of one or two teachers in London ; whereas, within these four years, an alteration in
the

the arrangement of the course has been made, which characterises it from every other course on the same subject.

Between three and four hundred pupils can afford ample testimony of this fact.

Several gentlemen who have attended my Father's public lectures for these two years past, have been requested to consider the Guide attentively, that they might discover whether there be any similar expressions, and they have uniformly declared that there are none. If any farther proof be required, the lecture shall be published, which will at once convince every one.

XII. *That the Author of the Guide had adopted and executed a certain inquiry, respecting the situation of the Professor of Midwifery in the University of Edinburgh, which had been threatened by Dr Hamilton, in a conversation with Dr Gregory, eight years before the publication of that work.*

ABOUT nine years ago, in consequence of a circumstance which Dr Gregory has fully explained, though not very accurately, my Father threatened to make a judicial inquiry into the causes which have placed the Professor of Midwifery, in this University,

University, in a different state from what he is in every regular university where such a professor is appointed. But his well known desire to avoid disturbing the harmony of his colleagues, has hitherto prevented him from taking the proper steps for that purpose.

Every person in the least acquainted with the knowledge which a medical practitioner ought to possess, will naturally be astonished, when he is told that Midwifery is not considered by the University of Edinburgh as a department of Medicine.

Dr Gregory has humorously endeavoured to prove, that a medical practitioner has no more to do with midwifery, than an old midwife has to do with the practice of physic.

Although *verbal* disquisitions, it is well known, occupy much of the Doctor's attention, yet he very properly, on some occasions, (viz. where he finds it for his interest), pretends to be ignorant that many words have two distinct significations. It was thus that he misrepresented the word *discovery* in his illiberal attack on Dr Priestly ; and it is thus that he misrepresents midwifery in his rude assault on my Father and myself. Yet the author of the

Guide

Guide had surely taught him, that lectures on midwifery do not describe merely the management of women during child-bearing, but comprehend a description of the treatment of the diseases peculiar to women and children. In mentioning, therefore, the reasons which have induced the members of the University to consider midwifery as unconnected with medicine, he should have stated the question thus: By the laws of the University of Edinburgh, a physician has no occasion to study the diseases of women and children, although such diseases daily form the subject of his attention; but he must study other subjects, not in the least connected with practice.

Dr Gregory has boasted, that he and others have long practised without having ever studied midwifery. With the result of his practice I am not acquainted; but that of others, to his certain knowledge, has not been such as to warrant any exultation in ignorance, which being highly dangerous to the community, is certainly quite unjustifiable. An illustration, already submitted to the Doctor, but very wisely totally disregarded by him, will place this matter in a proper point of view.

Suppose it possible that a physician should, from having not studied midwifery, mistake pregnancy for dropfy, what would be the consequence? He would prescribe violently stimulating medicines, which would necessarily induce abortion; and that accident, at certain periods of pregnancy, besides destroying the child, endangers highly the life of the mother. Indeed no woman can miscarry at the period at which pregnancy can be mistaken for dropfy, without incurring great hazard. That such a mistake has been committed, (even more than once, I am informed), is no secret among the students, and is well known to the Doctor. At the time that it happened, it impressed very strongly on the minds of those who witnessed it the necessity for attending to midwifery. The case overturned, within twenty-four hours, the reasoning which the gentleman had, as Dr Gregory asserts, employed for many years.

The questions in the Guide respecting the reasons which have placed the professor of midwifery in this University in such a situation, would naturally occur to every person who is told the circumstance; and
such

such questions are often put by my Father's pupils.

What an outrage, then, is it on common sense, to connect a very natural question with a proposed judicial inquiry, threatened nine years ago!

XIII. That the Style of the Guide, and many of the Thoughts expressed in it, are similar to those of the Translation of the New French Medical Constitution, published in the last volume of Dr Duncan's Commentaries, and executed by Dr James Hamilton junior.

THIS assertion tallies ill with another of the Doctor's allegations, that many of the expressions in the Guide were recognised to be my Father's. Did my Father assist at the Committee of the Medical Society of Paris, who drew up that elaborate Plan?

It must appear rather singular, that Dr Gregory should seek for similarity of style in a translation, especially when he had in his possession above seven hundred pages of original matter, published by my Father and myself within the same year with the Guide. Nor can it be urged in his defence, that the Doctor was not disposed to take proper advantage of this circum-

stance ; he tells us, that “ the perfect
 “ sameness, or even very near resemblance,
 “ both in thought and expression, were it
 “ but in a single sentence or couplet, to
 “ the composition of a preceding author,
 “ (if it were not acknowledged as borrow-
 “ ed), would be complete internal evidence
 “ of plagiarism.” It is exceedingly unfor-
 tunate for the Doctor, that he could not
 find, in seven hundred pages on the sub-
 ject of midwifery, a single couplet similar
 to any in the Guide, and that he was
 therefore obliged to have recourse to a
 translation.

Dr Gregory has noticed particularly one
 expression common to the Guide and to
 the Translation of the French Medical
 Constitution, viz. *the healing art*. What
 a pity it is that that expression occurs on-
 ly twice in above seven hundred pages
 published professedly by us, viz. the
 Treatise on the Management of Female
 Complaints, and the Letters to Dr Os-
 born ! *Quæ res in se neque consilium neque mo-
 dum habet nullum, eam consilio regere non potes.*

The Guide, in several places, especially
 in the postscript, bears strong evidence
 that it was written previous to the meet-
 ing of the summer classes, that is, previ-

ous to May 1792. But the volume of the *Histoire de la Société Royale de Médecine de Paris*, in which the plan of the New Medical Constitution is detailed, did not reach Edinburgh till towards the latter end of June that year, and was never in my possession, as the books of the College Library can shew, till the 5th of July ; or, in other words, till two or three months after the Guide appears to have been written.

As Dr Gregory does not lay much stress on the assertion under consideration, I should have passed it over, had it not afforded me an excellent opportunity of paying a due tribute of respect to the Doctor's wonderful abilities.

If the reader take the trouble to compare the Doctor's method of detecting plagiarism, just quoted, with the following observation, selected from his celebrated Introduction to his Philosophical and Literary Essays, he will be struck with admiration, and perhaps with terror.

“ It is possible, in some cases, to ascertain the most secret thoughts of men, in spite of their own boldest assertions and denials.”

Tremble, ye innocent, and ye guilty !

Ye

Ye innocent, tremble ! for if ye inadvertently stumble on a single couplet similar in composition to, or very nearly resembling in thought, an expression in an anonymous pamphlet, whether the pamphlet be written before or after any publication in which ye may have been engaged, ye shall be judged guilty of being concerned in the anonymous work ! And tremble, ye guilty ! for behold a man who can ascertain your most secret thoughts, in spite of your own boldest assertions and denials !

SUCH, then, is Dr Gregory's Internal Evidence. *Credule quid frustra simulacra fugacia captas, quod petis est nunquam.* Divested of its meretricious ornaments, sophistical reasoning, and misrepresented facts, it amounts to this, that in the pamphlet intitled, 'A Guide for Gentlemen studying Medicine at the University of Edinburgh,' some professors are censured, and many are warmly praised ; that Dr Rutherford, who, Dr Gregory has alleged, has long endeavoured to injure my Father, is particularly censured, and that my Father is very much praised.

Now

Now had it been proved, 1st, That Dr Rutherford's pretended attempts, for we do not believe Dr Gregory's account, were known to my Father, and that he was capable of resenting them; 2^{dly}, That the opinion of the botanic lectures, expressed in the Guide, is peculiar to us; and, 3^{dly}, That my Father's course of lectures do not merit any encomium: then it might have been inferred from the internal evidence of the pamphlet, that the author had had some communication with us. But as Dr Rutherford's conduct was totally unknown to us, as the observations in the Guide on his lectures express the erroneous sentiments of many students, and as malice itself cannot deprive my Father of that reputation as a teacher and practitioner which he has long enjoyed; Dr Gregory's internal evidence, like stage-lightning, although formidable in appearance, must terminate in smoke.

DR GREGORY'S COLLATERAL EVIDENCE.

I. *That the Publishers did not answer the Demand of Dr Rutherford's Attorney, made*

on the 28th of November, until the 5th day of December ; by which there was just time to have written to Edinburgh, and to have received proper instructions.

I shall not calculate the number of places to which they might have written within exactly the same space of time ; but taking it at fifty only, the argument cannot be allowed much weight.

From the tenor of Mr Chalmer's letter, p 23. it is more than probable that it will appear in proof, that those gentlemen did not write to Edinburgh on the subject.

II. *That Dr James Hamilton junior mentioned to a gentleman, that it was probable the author of the Guide had received some hints from himself or his Father, by means of information conveyed to a friend in London.*

The conversation to which Dr Gregory here alludes, I very well remember. The substance of it was shortly this :

I told Dr Adair jun. for he is the gentleman who so honourably reported it, that having had no concern whatever with the author or publisher of the pamphlet, I was astonished how it should be attributed to me. He hinted as a reason, that there were many circumstances in the account of my
Father's

Father's class which had given some colour to the suspicion. In answer, I observed, that not only all his pupils know perfectly the general plan of my Father's lectures, but that I had also had occasion to write to London about many circumstances which might have been made use of without my knowledge. These letters were about the projected lying-in hospital ; for, as my Father and myself wished to render that institution as perfect as possible, we wrote both to London and Dublin on the subject, that we might derive every advantage from the experience of those who superintended similar hospitals. Nay more, a number of proposals for the Edinburgh General Lying-in-hospital were sent to London, and a liberal subscription received from one gentleman there. I shall leave it to the two Doctors to settle by whose contrivance this conversation has been represented, as in the argument under consideration.

III. *That about the end of September last, Dr James Hamilton junior had boasted to a Gentleman, of having written books to which he had not put his name, and had mentioned that*

he should soon appear before the public in that way.

The same communicative gentleman mentioned in the last section, must be again introduced to the acquaintance of the reader.

About the middle of September last, I was requested, by a near relation of Dr Adair junior, to attend a poor woman in the eighth month of pregnancy, then affected with peripneumony. I readily agreed to the request, and for two or three weeks met in consultation with Dr Adair, generally twice a-day, and sometimes oftener. The woman was delivered by my assistance; and, in short, although the case for a long time seemed to be desperate, by our united endeavours, the patient recovered entirely.

During the course of that attendance, I had the honour to receive frequent visits from the Doctor, by which a friendship between us, on my part sincere, was established. With great openness I communicated to him all my views. Among many other subjects of conversation, I recollect well having repeatedly mentioned with regret, that although I had, during the last two or three years, written a great deal

deal for the press, I had received very little credit for all my labour, as nothing had appeared in my own name; and that now, when I was wishing to have brought forward my projected improved edition of Morgagni, I had been obliged, from motives of gratitude to Dr Duncan, to undertake a difficult and extensive translation for his Commentaries*, by which I should be again prevented for some time from appearing *in propria persona*. The works to which I alluded, were not only my Father's publications, but also medical Theses, in the composition of some of which I had assisted, and in that of others I had been solely engaged. This Dr Adair well knew; for I explained to him the conduct of one gentleman in Dublin respecting a Thesis which I had written for him. It was on Uterine Hæmorrhagy. The gentleman having graduated at Glasgow, did not print it. Therefore I wrote to him for the copy, that, with some alte-

* I never expected that this circumstance would have been so very handsomely acknowledged by Dr Duncan, as it has been in the preface to his last volume of the Commentaries: For the flattering compliment paid me there was totally unknown to my Father and myself, till pointed out by Dr Gregory at the meeting of the Senatus Academicus on the 21st of December.

rations, I might publish it as an essay in my own name.

The gentleman took no notice of my letter; but to my very great surprise, many months after, he wrote to my Father, requesting a list of his titles, that he might dedicate the Essay (my Essay) to him. Further, he modestly desired, that I would do him the favour to suggest any improvements which might have occurred to me in consequence of additional experience; and above all, that I would send him a few more cases. I immediately answered him; and my letter was couched in such terms, that he durst not publish the Essay in his own name; but I had reason to believe, from some information I had received, that it was offered for publication in London. Dr Adair knew all these particulars, and he also knew that I had once some thoughts of publishing at first, without my name, a few observations on the use of the vectis. The candid reader will form a proper opinion of the persons who could apply this information in the manner in which Drs Gregory and Adair have done.

IV. *That a few days after the Conversation detailed in the last Section, Dr James Hamilton*

milton junior had put into the hands of the same Gentleman, (viz. Dr Adair), a copy of the Guide, inscribed " From the Author," nearly a month before the Pamphlet was published here.

On the 6th day of October, as already stated, I received a copy of the pamphlet by the hands of Mr Guthrie bookseller, South Bridge, to whom it, and my Father's copy, came, in a parcel along with another copy for one of the Professors, from the Mess. Robinson of London, which was conveyed by the mail-coach.

The letter from the Mess. Robinson, sent along with the parcel, Mr Guthrie was obliging enough to show me. It is dated the 2d of October; and the invoices sent to Mess. Bell and Bradfute, Hill, and Mudie, along with their parcels of the Guide, were dated also on the 2d of that month: so that some copies having been sent by the mail, and others by sea, the former were here sooner than the latter. But I am informed, that the book was in several shops within a few days after I saw it.

At any rate, as other Gentlemen besides myself received copies from the author at the same time, the allegation under consideration is proved to be absolutely false.

V. *That when Dr Gregory's accusation of Dr Alexander Hamilton was pending before the Senatus Academicus, he received a letter, signed J. Johnson, plainly intended to bias the determination of the Committee, and implying an accurate knowledge, not only of what was going forward in Edinburgh, but also of the very day of meeting of the Senatus Academicus.*

Si quid mihi credas, nunquam amavi istum hominem. Sed quo crimine cæcidit? Quis delator? Quibus testibus? Nihil horum, GRANDIS EPISTOLA a CAPREIS venit. This letter is dated, London, December 18. so that it should have reached Edinburgh on the 21st, the day before the Committee met, had it been put into the post-office in London on the day of its date; but as it did not arrive at Edinburgh sooner than the 24th, it is evident that it was not put into the post-office there till the 21st.

This letter my Father declared to be all a mystery to him; and so it undoubtedly was. He had written a strong letter to the Principal, regretting that the Committee had not met on Saturday the 15th, as he had expected, and requesting that a meeting might be held on the 17th; to which

Dr

Dr Robertson answered, That he was convinced the members of the committee could not meet on that day ; my Father therefore knew nothing whatever of the day of meeting till the 21st, when he sent early in the morning, to know from the janitor of the college, whether he had received orders for summoning the committee for the following day.

Dr Gregory's reasoning on the letter is very curious. It was erroneously dated, and did not arrive in proper time ; *ergo*, it came from Edinburgh, from a practitioner there, and from one at least connected with some member of the University. Yet, had it arrived at the exact time, the day before the meeting of the committee, there would have been clear proof, he would have alleged, that it did so.

At the time that Dr Gregory produced this letter, my Father and I firmly believed that it was a manœuvre of some of the parties interested in injuring us ; but since it is written in the same hand as the answer which Dr Gregory received to the letter addressed to the author, sent to the Mess. Robinson, that suspicion is entirely effaced. And from what those gentlemen
have

have said to Mr Chalmer, it is clear that it could not proceed from us.

But from the time that Dr Gregory had brought the affair before the *Senatus Academicus*, the circumstance was so much the subject of public conversation, that Dr Adair's wife wrote an account of the whole transaction to her husband, then in the country. He, as he informed me on his return, in answer to her letter, observed, that she had probably mistaken Gregory for Rutherford.

The subject was also talked of among the members of the Medical Society on Saturday the 15th of January. As, therefore, the matter was very widely known, if the author have any acquaintance at Edinburgh, he might have easily learned what was going forward.

VI. *That Dr Gregory wrote two letters to J. Johnson, Esq; and sent them to the Mess. Robinson, to be transmitted by them to the Author of the Guide; that he received an answer just within the time which was required to have sent these letters to Edinburgh, and to have returned an answer to London, that it might be conveyed to him by post.*

The

The gentlemen concerned in the combination to injure me had good reason to believe, that the publishers of the Guide would never discover the author of that work; and they imagined, that so long as he should remain concealed, they might persuade the malicious part of the world, that I was certainly the person.

But the Doctor, unfortunately for them, by his too great zeal in so laudable a cause, has, like MARPLOT, spoiled the whole; for by sending the two letters alluded to, he has afforded me the most unequivocal circumstantial evidence of my having had no concern in that pamphlet which could have been produced.

If the Mess. Robinson sent the Doctor's letters to any part of England, in a direction from London opposite to that of Edinburgh, as, for example, to Bath or Bristol, and if the Doctor received an answer within the space of eleven days from the arrival of his letter at London, it is clear to a demonstration, that the person who wrote the answer could have had no communication with Edinburgh within that time.

It is much more than probable, that in the course of the judicial proceedings carrying on by my Father and the Doctor,

this will be proved to be the case ; for Mr Chalmer says, Mr Robinson “ added sundry circumstances, which convince me, “ that you (*Dr Gregory*) have been led “ to form erroneous conclusions on the “ subject.”

In many cases, circumstantial evidence is preferable to direct testimony. Two witnesses may swear positively, that they saw a particular person perpetrate a robbery, or a murder ; but if that person can prove from circumstances, that he was at the time mentioned by the witnesses at a great distance from the scene of action, their evidence will be disregarded.

In the same manner, it is probable, that, in consideration of a sum of money, a person might be prevailed on to declare himself the author of the Guide ; and hence direct testimony could be brought to prove my having had no concern in it. But surely, if it can be shewn, that letters addressed to the author of that work were sent in such a direction, that the person who wrote the answer could not possibly have had any communication whatever with me, the proof that I had no concern in the publication will be much stronger than it could have been by any testimony of that kind.

VII. *That*

VII. *That Dr James Hamilton's letter on the 17th of January, to Dr Gregory, was in consequence of the letters addressed to J. Johnson, Esq; conveyed to the Mess. Robinson.*

As the Doctor's intention in writing the two letters alluded to was, he alleges, to force me to take some preposterous method of clearing myself, by which he might obtain proof of my guilt, the letter which I wrote to him on the 17th of January proved, he observes, that his endeavours had not been fruitless; for that the bait had taken.

The Doctor, with much humour, compares the operation of his letter to that of some nauseous drugs, which on many occasions are highly beneficial; and hence he modestly assumes to himself no small degree of merit for his wonderful ingenuity. But if the effect of his prescriptions in other cases be as much the reverse of what he intends as it has been in the present instance, I am afraid the success of his practice will be somewhat similar to that of the great SANGRADO, — however different his plan of cure may be.

Had not the Doctor written those letters, and sent them to the Mess. Robinson, any declaration of these gentlemen, as long as they should conceal the author, would not have entirely cleared me; and

therefore I should certainly have fallen a sacrifice to the deep plot which was so artfully contrived against me.

THUS the collateral evidence adduced by Dr Gregory is shewn to be either the creation of his own fancy, or the misrepresentations of others.

I shall now exhibit a summary view of the Doctor's assertions, by which I have an opportunity of introducing a few trifling misrepresentations which did not merit any formal notice, recalling to the learned Doctor's recollection the celebrated Lord Bacon's observation, "*Prudens interrogatio est dimidium scientiæ.*"

Dr Gregory's Assertions

Proved false.

1. That I made an appeal to the public. *

2. That it never was his intention to injure me.

3. That the Author of the Guide seems intimately acquainted with every recent transaction in the University.

1. That appeal only now made.

2. The whole tenor of his pamphlet shews this.

3. Yet nothing can be found in it which every student does not know.

I 2

4. That

* Consider, indulgent reader, the admirable specimen of the Doctor's correctness, ingenuousness, and uprightness, which the very first sentence of his pamphlet exhibits. He asserts, that I made an appeal to the public; but I only threatened to do so. I distributed my correspondence with him among his own brethren only, and I informed him, in a note sent along with a copy of my circular letter, that I had done so.

*Dr Gregory's Assertions**Proved false.*

4. That the Mess. Robinson declared they got the Guide from their correspondent in Edinburgh.

5 That I mentioned to a gentleman, that I had given hints on the subject of the Guide to a friend in London.

6. That in a private letter to my Father, Dr Gregory intimated to him how much he was interested in the inquiry brought by him before the Senatus Academicus.

7 That in consequence of my publication of his letter, he was called on to defend himself, by explaining his conduct, which he had done accordingly.

8. That the Guide is principally designed to raise the fame and promote the pecuniary interest of the present professor of midwifery.

4. Their declaration to Mr Chalmer proves the reverse.

5. Proved (page 58.) to be a misrepresentation.

6. But in that private letter * he only told him that he was much interested, not why or how.

7. His pamphlet, I have reason to believe, was in the hands of the printer before he had any letter from me.

8. Yet the praises of other classes are as warm, and the account of others as full as those of my Father's; and the great increase of his pupils for two or three years previous to the appearance of the Guide, shews incontestibly that his lectures required no extraordinary means to recommend them.

9. That

* The reader shall judge for himself.

“ Sir, Along with this you will receive a copy of a circular letter which I have this day sent to all my colleges of the University of Edinburgh. That letter will sufficiently explain itself; but as what I have to lay before the Senatus Academicus most peculiarly concerns you, I think it right to give you this private intimation, in order that you may arrange your matters so as to be at the University meeting, whatever other intentions or avocations you may have had. You can have no business more interesting to yourself than what I am to lay before the Senatus Academicus.

“ I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

(Signed) “ JAS GREGORY.”

*Dr Gregory's Assertions**Proved false.*

9. That the Guide is also designed to decry the Botanical and Mathematical classes.

10. That the author of the Guide must be intimately acquainted with my Father's family, for he mentions that I was educated with the sole view of being his assistant in teaching.

11. That private teachers are decried in the Guide, and that there is a private teacher at present here, who is my Father's rival in teaching and in practice.

12. That in the Guide an inquiry is made respecting the situation of the Professor of Midwifery, which was threatened by my Father nine years ago.

13. That physicians may practise successfully without any knowledge of Midwifery.

14. That the Guide is a prototype of the new French Medical Constitution, and that many sentences of my translation of that plan correspond with passages of the Guide.

15. That many expressions of the Guide are the well-known expressions of my Father.

9. But although both these classes were annihilated, it would not add a single pupil to the Midwifery class.

10. Yet all that is said of me is what my Father has publicly mentioned many hundred times, while the assistant of another professor, who had only appeared lately, is very warmly praised.

11. But the expressions in the Guide do not warrant this conclusion; and no private teacher can affect my Father's practice or success in teaching.

12. What has been styled the inquiry, is merely a natural question, why Midwifery should not be considered a department of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh. The inquiry alluded to by my Father, Dr Gregory knows well, was a judicial one.

13. Although such physicians mistake pregnancy for dropsy, and hence occasionally destroy at least one life.

14. Yet the Guide bears the strongest possible evidence that it was written previous to May 1792; but the volume in which the plan of the French Medical Constitution is detailed did not reach Edinburgh before the end of June, and was not in my possession till July.

15. Yet surely the pupils who recognised these phrases, had they written the Guide, might have used them. Besides, Dr Gregory's preceding assertion contradicts this flatly.

16. That

*Dr Gregory's Assertions**Proved false.*

16. That the language of the Guide shews it came from Edinburgh.

17. That I had boasted of having published books without my name, and that I should soon appear in that way.

18. That my Father knew sooner than any one else the day of meeting of the committee of the Senatus Academicus.

19. That the Mess. Robinson of London had sent his letters addressed to J. Johnston, Esq; to me.

20. That my letter of the 17th January was in consequence of his letters to J. Johnston, Esq;

21. That I employed misrepresentation and falsehood in the account which I gave of his words and actions.

16. Yet not a scotticism can be discovered in the Guide.

17. Proved (p 60.) to be a glaring misrepresentation.

18. But he did not know it till the preceding day.

19. But the declaration of those gentlemen, detailed p.25. proves that these letters were never sent to me.

20. Yet I never knew any thing whatever of his letters.

21. This allegation he himself has contradicted, as proved, (p. 80, &c.)

Instead of making any reflections on this catalogue of misrepresentations, (to use the softest term), I thankfully avail myself of the Doctor's own words to express my sentiments of his conduct.

“ When a man who makes such an appeal, and wishes the public to decide in his cause, instead of telling the whole tale, tells but a very little of it, and that little very erroneously, stating only
“ what

“ what is in his own favour, suppressing
 “ whatever can make against him, and
 “ misrepresenting the words, the mean-
 “ ing, and the conduct of his adversary,
 “ it must be believed that he has the most
 “ substantial reasons for acting in a man-
 “ ner so evidently disingenuous.”

ON the whole, the evidence which he
 has brought forward is clearly such as
 would never have influenced the opinion
 of any man who had nothing more than
 truth in view. Every fact which he has
 alleged has been shewn to be either totally
 unfounded or misrepresented; and every
 argument is either absurd or sophistical.

III. PROOF THAT SOME CIRCUMSTANCES WERE OR MIGHT HAVE BEEN KNOWN TO DR GREGORY, WHICH SHEW CLEAR- LY THAT THERE WERE NO GROUNDS OF SUSPICION AGAINST ME.

HAVING thus pointed out the fallacy
 of all his arguments in his celebrated
 pamphlet, I proceed, as I proposed, to
 prove, that some circumstances were or
 might have been known to him, which
 shew

shew clearly, that there were no grounds of suspicion against me.

I. My Father's class had been so much on the increase for three years previous to the publication of the Guide, that the number of pupils, during the year before that work appeared, was more than double what it had been three years before.

The world has hitherto supposed, that the various arts of empyricks, to puff themselves off, were only employed by those who had occasion for such artifices to raise their "credit and renown." But it was left for the original genius of Dr Gregory, to shew that this general opinion is an error, and to prove, that a man who had acquired a degree of reputation as a teacher, an author, and a practitioner, which Dr Gregory's laudable endeavours cannot affect, should have recourse to the publication of a Quack-bill in his own favour, and that too at the very time when his pupils were increasing every course!

II. As the establishment of a general Lying-in Hospital, on the plan suggested by my Father, rendered it more than probable that the pupils of his class would

M

continue

continue to increase, any underhand means to attain that end, would have been equally imprudent, as they were unnecessary.

III. FROM the continued increase of the pupils of that class ever since I had had the principal share in the duty, it was evident that the united exertions of my Father and myself had been attended with a degree of success equal to our most sanguine expectations. That increase has not been interrupted, notwithstanding the attempts of Dr Gregory and others; for the number of pupils this year is more than *triple* what it was the year before I began to assist my Father.

I required, therefore, no extraordinary praise in my favour; and it must be allowed I have received none, the Author of the Guide having just expressed what has been repeated by my Father several hundred times to many hundred persons.

IV. As the success of the other Professors could not affect my Father's class, it would not have been consistent with our line of conduct in other affairs of life, to have incurred the risk of detection, by decrying the Lectures of those who had rendered

dered themselves obnoxious to him, which could have served no other purpose than the gratification of revenge, even allowing that we had been capable of being actuated by such mean and grovelling motives.

Lastly, THE interest which we took in the establishment of the general Lying-in-Hospital rendered it absolutely necessary for us to avoid every dispute with our brethren, and to endeavour, by every laudable means, to conciliate general favour.

AFTER this detail, the world will judge what dependence can be placed on a man who has been for several months exerting much ingenuity, sacrificing much time, and expending much money, for the very benevolent purpose of injuring a young man in the opinion of a Father who has always placed implicit confidence in him, and of ruining him in the eyes of that public on whose protection his future comfort in life must depend; and all this, not only without having urged any adequate motive for his conduct, but without having had even the shadow of truth or probability on his side. *Frustra autem niti, neque aliud se fatigando nisi ODIUM querere, EXTREMÆ DEMENTIÆ est.*

IV. PROOF THAT I HAVE BEEN CALUMNIATED AND INJURED IN A MOST UNJUSTIFIABLE MANNER.

NOT contented with having accused me of being the Author of the Guide, and of denying my concern in the publication, Dr Gregory endeavours also to prove, that I had misrepresented both his words and actions. The train of reasoning which he employs in support of this charge, is so obviously absurd, is such an insult to human understanding, that he has taken care to foist it in after he had artfully prepared, by a string of fictions, uttered with great boldness, the minds of his readers to receive any impression of me, however bad. It occurs in the 129th page of his pamphlet. He accuses me of having misrepresented his words and actions, in the correspondence which I laid before the medical practitioners and professors of the university, termed by him, my Appeal to the Public. But he shall be condemned by his own account of the matter, although, by the bye, it is not an accurate one.

In

In my second letter to Dr Gregory I said, “ You mentioned to my Father, on “ the 11th of December, that you could “ bring your charge home to me ; you “ have now denied that,” &c. And in the circular letter which inclosed the correspondence, I observed, “ I therefore “ thought it incumbent on me, not only “ formally to disavow being either directly “ or indirectly concerned in that publica- “ tion, (viz. the Guide,) but also to en- “ deavour to ascertain the circumstances “ on which so extraordinary a charge “ could be founded. For that purpose I “ addressed the letters, of which copies “ are inclosed, to the gentlemen who had “ principally countenanced the report. “ The answers which I received are so “ little satisfactory, that I think it proper “ to take the liberty of submitting them “ to your perusal.” Therefore, in my account of his words and actions, I alleged, *1st*, That he had asserted to my Father, on the 11th of December, that he could bring his charge home to me ; *2dly*, That he had denied that assertion ; *3dly*, That I had written to him in order to ascertain the circumstances on which his very extraordinary charge was founded ;
and

and *lastly*, That his answer was very unsatisfactory.

Observe the admirable ingenuity by which he alleges that this account is misrepresented. *1st*, He says, That he did not assert to my Father, that he could bring his charge home to me: he only said, “ No matter, I shall bring it home *either* to “ you or your Son ;” but as he had failed to do so to my Father, I was forced to understand that he meant me.

But the Doctor has (perhaps through inadvertency) given an erroneous account of this expression: the words were marked down a few minutes after he pronounced them; they were, “ No matter, I “ can bring it home directly to your “ Son, and I hope also to yourself.”

2^{dly}, He insists, That he never denied his assertion! What meaning then must we assign to the very first sentence of his Letter? He may probably wish that it should be understood to be as destitute of meaning as it is deficient in grammar: “ Having no direct knowledge of who were “ or who were not concerned in the composition and publication of the pamphlet “ you mention, I never thought myself “ intitled to allege, or simply and positively

“ tively assert, that you or that your Father had or had not any concern in it.”

3dly, He observes, That I did not chuse to understand his allusion to the internal evidence, and collateral circumstances, on which the general suspicions respecting the origin of the pamphlet were founded.

How, in the name of common sense, could I be acquainted with circumstances, not only utterly false, but even void of probability?

The only internal evidence which I knew was, that my Father's class was, along with others, highly praised, and that Dr Rutherford's (whose conduct to my Father had been fully commented on by Dr Gregory, at the Committee of the *Senatus Academicus*) was decried. But I considered that evidence to be very absurd; for it was well known that my Father's class had been for some years so much on the increase, that no extraordinary means for introducing it to notice were required; and what was said of Dr Rutherford was only the general very erroneous opinion of the students; a circumstance even mentioned, I am told, at a meeting of the *Senatus Academicus*. Besides, had it even been proved that the expressions respecting

specting the Botanical class had been merely the suggestions of malice, it would still have been necessary to have shewn, that it was impossible for any other person than my Father to have formed a prejudice against Dr Rutherford. But in this world, it is well known, that however great one's abilities may be, however engaging one's manners, or amiable one's dispositions, it is not easy to steer clear of the malevolent and envious ; nor is it possible to acquire universal esteem, or conciliate general favour.

Of the collateral circumstances I had not the most distant idea ; for I could not divine that my letter to Dr Gregory should coincide nearly in point of date with his answer from the Author of the Guide ; and I could not conceive that any gentleman, much less one who pretended to be my friend, nay, who had voluntarily courted my acquaintance, would repeat conversations which could be misrepresented in the manner which Dr Gregory has done those reported to him from me.

My letter to Dr Gregory plainly shewed that I wished to know the circumstances on which his suspicions were founded, that I might have an opportunity of clearing myself.

myself. But in answer, I am told, that his belief was founded on circumstantial evidence, which he would not explain; but that, in defence of his belief, so strong was it, he would risk his life and fortune—he would fight me with pistols—or with law!

My correspondence with himself and Dr Rutherford, Dr Gregory asserts, astonished and entertained all who saw it; and well it might, for the world always enjoys “to hiss the baffled ass.” Dr Gregory had lately usurped the dictatorship in the philosophical world, and yet in his letter to me, he has violated the laws of grammar and of common sense. No wonder it should excite much astonishment and entertainment.

The distribution of this correspondence has afforded an excellent pretence for continuing their calumnies, to those who have so zealously endeavoured to injure me. They have with great industry rendered it generally believed, and Dr Gregory himself sanctions the opinion, that if I had not printed that correspondence, Dr Gregory would never have published his celebrated pamphlet; hence I have been accused of being the cause of all the injury

N

which

which will probably accrue to the University from this very singular affair.

A review of the circumstances in which I was placed, (p. 13.), must convince every man of candour and liberality, that it was impossible for me to avoid taking that step. *Qui autem non defendit nec obsistit, si potest, injuriæ, tam in vitio est quam si parentes, aut amicos, aut patriam, aut socios deferat.*

But what must be the feelings of my reader, when he is informed, that Dr Gregory's pamphlet was actually in the hands of the printer before I had any correspondence whatever with him. By an unexpected accident, I learned the circumstance a few days after my circular letter was printed. Indeed the inconsistency of the Doctor's account of his motives for attacking my Father and myself, completely confirms the intelligence which I had received.

THE candid and intelligent reader will now judge whether I had not reason to complain that I have been much injured, and to insinuate, "that Dr Gregory is one of my greatest wrong doers." Whether his
attack

attack on my Father and myself be the result of his own determination, or be the consequence of his being made the dupe of others, I shall not pretend to determine.

But I think myself intitled to declare my firm belief; that no other member of the College of Physicians would have acted in such an extraordinary manner as he has done.

What a prospect does the conduct of this gentleman towards me hold out to medical practitioners beginning the career of life. In vain shall they anxiously endeavour to acquire a proper knowledge of their profession; in vain shall they patiently exert their utmost industry in the exercise of its duties; and in vain shall they religiously observe the rules of the strictest honour in all their dealings with the world; their progress shall be interrupted, their best founded expectations disappointed, by the first man who is malicious enough boldly to accuse them of villany — provided he have abilities sufficient to invent a plausible story, or even to tell his story in a plausible manner. And shall the malicious still possess such power?

The honour, the duty, the interest of mankind, forbid it!

This

This singular controversy is thus terminated, in so far as I am concerned; for I think myself intitled to declare, (I hope with the approbation of every man of probity and honour), That I shall pay no regard whatever to any thing which may in future proceed from Dr Gregory's pen.

EDINBURGH, CASTLEHILL,

August 24. 1793.

